

MINUTES - FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 1983

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert B. Patterson at 3:13 p.m.

I. Correction of Minutes.

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of December 1, 1982 were approved as distributed.

II. Reports of Officers.

The CHAIR informed the Senate that the President would be glad to answer questions and SENATOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, requested a "reading on the ship of state these days". PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN responded as follows:

President
Comments
on Budget

As you know, Ray, there have been no definitive stances taken by the Legislature with respect to the budget or any activity that they might have taken with respect to the budget reductions of the University of South Carolina. It is still a very open process. We are participating in it fully. Fortunately, there have been opportunities given for discussion on a fuller scale than the media provided with respect to some of the reductions that were made and expressions of unhappiness by the University Administration and a number of faculty and the Board of Trustees at having to make reductions. The big question is not frankly specific cuts but the fact that we are in a budgetary situation where we are forced to make them at all and that position continues to be our problem even with the reductions made at the December meeting as unhappy and as unpleasant as they seem to be with specific reference to particular colleges and agencies and departments. There is no doubt in my mind that we are going to have to make additional reductions at the February meeting of the Board of Trustees and we are going to have to have a rather substantial tuition increase probably adopted at the April Board of Trustees meeting. I don't know yet what that is going to be but there is so much discussion with respect to the revenue package and the various revenue proposals that are before the House and the Senate, particularly the House, at this point in time that I don't think we ought to spend any of that money. I think we ought to step back and make sure that a revenue package is indeed in place before we take any great solace that the situation is resolved and we can move on. I think it is a tough time. I am very worried about the capacity of the institution, not to survive; I think there is no question about the fact that we will survive. I am much more worried about the tendency towards academic cannibalism which can be prevalent on a campus when budget reductions are required. I hope that above all else, and I know this will make the tenure track faculty who have not achieved that objective yet less comfortable than those who have achieved it, I hope that we can avoid at all costs the reduction of tenured faculty - the elimination of their slots. I think that is important to the long term future of the University of South Carolina and we will do everything within our power to avoid that. I hasten to add that in all of the reductions that we have made to date we have not touched tenured faculty and that is extremely important to us. I think it is going to be a long and perhaps difficult spring but the economists are now saying with the same degree of certainty that they have been saying it for some months that we have bottomed out. Let's have some kind of silent meditation that they are closer to the truth and to reality than they have been in the past.

PROFESSOR MOORE then asked President Holderman as to how the University of South Carolina had voted in the recent actions taken by the NCAA with respect to eligibility and academic requirements for freshmen athletes. PROFESSOR MOORE wished to know whether or not the University had supported those resolutions. PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN responded as follows:

Question on
USC Support
of NCAA
Freshmen
Requirements

The University of South Carolina, as I'm sure will surprise no one, came down squarely on the side of improving the quality of undergraduate admissions including athletes. And we are fully supported in that move by the Director of Athletics, by the head football coach, by the head basketball coach and all others. We are conscious of it. I frankly was astonished at the opposition that was generated to the 700 SAT minimum particularly from predominantly black university presidents. I do think they should have more faith in the capacity of blacks to survive and make it in academic institutions. This institution, Carolina, is living proof that blacks have a better survival rate than whites once they get into the place as undergraduates. I would hope that there could be a national growth of confidence that we can provide adequate and competitive education without a variance in standards regardless of race, creed, color, religion, sex or national origin. I believe that the NCAA took some steps in the right direction. If you are asking me how recruiting is going, a man who was made the 29th American cardinal this morning in Rome has been helping us a bit with some recruits in the Chicago Catholic high schools. He asked me the other day what he could promise them - I suggested salvation and he asked me rather wisely if that was in any way a violation of the NCAA regulations.

Questions
on
New
Summer
School
Schedule

PROFESSOR KATHLEEN PADGET, PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT, asked three questions regarding the summer school schedule: 1) the rationale behind the schedule? 2) how much faculty input was there to the development of this schedule? and 3) are "there plans to have some cost effectiveness accountability procedures set up for the future?"

The PRESIDENT responded that there was a plan to monitor the entire summer school session operation and that it was the hope that the four day week will produce substantial savings in utility costs in light of the fact that air conditioning costs considerably more than heat on our campus. The PRESIDENT also explained that the recommendations which resulted in the revised summer school operation had been produced by a faculty committee composed entirely of faculty chaired by Professor Glenn Abernathy. The PRESIDENT argued that "faculty input was the principle consideration given the final determination of programmatic recommendations" and asked Professor Abernathy for comments. PROFESSOR GLENN ABERNATHY, DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, explained that although his committee did not make the specific recommendation which has resulted in the official new summer school calendar, the committee did suggest strong consideration for more flexibility in the establishment of the calendar and that it was the unanimous strong recommendation that Saturday classes were a problem. PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN commented that there were others that participated in the determination of the new summer school schedule, others drawn from both the faculty and the administration. He explained that there will have to be buildings kept open seven days a week during the summer just as is now the case during the Christmas holiday period. He reiterated that the major goal compressing the class schedule into four days is to reduce the use of as many buildings and offices as possible. The President also added that there was "no intention on the part of the committee or the administration, or the committee which ultimately made the recommendation which is a broader committee than Dr. Abernathy's committee, to deprive anybody of their opportunity to do the kind of research that they have to do in their specific laboratory and we will try to accommodate everybody as we can in that regard with the hope that you will cooperate with us in trying to reduce the cost of operating the buildings on the weekends." PROFESSOR DAVID HILL, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, inquired of the President what is the rationale "for 15% pay rate for summer school teaching" which he argued leads to the situation where the University incurs a cost of "\$6,000 for teaching two 100 level courses that a TA could do for \$700". PROFESSOR HILL explained to the Senate that he suggested through the Summer School Committee that they study the rate of payment for summer school and he would advise "the flat rate of \$1500 per course for example which would allow many more courses to be taught and for people to have the opportunity to teach". PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN responded as follows:

I don't think you want to submit that to a vote here today. Let me try to put it into a historical perspective with which I have very little knowledge because the determination to move in

the direction that we now find ourselves was adopted prior to Jim Holderman's arrival at Carolina. I want to say for the record that a number of things with which we have to live happened before I came to Carolina so although the morning that Bob Marcum fired Richard Bell I happened to have the radio on and I was blamed for the problems stretching back to Rex Enright in athletics here at Carolina which was about the time I was born! The 15% rule is one that is built into contracts with faculty hired prior to 1974, and it is one that was established at that time. I do not know the rationale for the 15% rule. I do know that it is contractually related to a number of people's relationships with this University and the University is trying to honor those particular relationships as best it can.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE explained he recalled when he came to the University the 15% rule was in effect and that "the 15% is predicated on approximately that percentage that the summer school made up of the yearly calendar".

Faculty
Committee
Nominations
Solicited

There being no further questions of the President and no further statements or announcements from administrative officers, the Chair made several announcements. He reminded the Senate that at its March meeting there will be held the annual election for faculty committee members. Therefore, on behalf of the Steering Committee, he solicited nominations from members of the Senate and explained that the Steering Committee would be having two meetings prior to the next Senate meeting in order to produce a slate to present to the Senate. He requested that these nominations be sent in writing or they could be accepted by Mrs. Pickels, the Faculty Senate Administrative Assistant, over the telephone. Nominations were requested to be submitted by February 15th. The CHAIR also informed the Senate that sometime in the future they can "look forward to a visit from Coach Morrison". The CHAIR explained that it had come to his attention that the Coach was interested in talking to the Senate and that the Chair had suggested to him that "the February meeting might not now be the best time to talk about athletics because of other matters on our agenda but I told him as soon as I could see a desirable atmosphere for such a session that I would invite him".

Coach
Morrison
to be
Invited
to Senate

III. Reports of Committees.

A. Faculty Senate Steering Committee, Professor David Husband:

Committee
Appoint-
ments

PROFESSOR HUSBAND explained that the Faculty Secretary, Professor Gardner, had asked him to serve as Secretary because Professor Gardner was hosting a National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience. PROFESSOR HUSBAND then went on to announce the Steering Committee has appointed to the Academic Forward Planning Committee two individuals who will take the place of members going on sabbatical. Specifically, Professor Alan Sear, School of Public Health, will replace Professor George Rogers, Department of History, for one semester. Professor Roger Sawyer, Department of Biology, will replace Professor David Rembert, Department of Biology, for one year.

B. Grade Change Committee, Professor Patricia Mason, Chair:

The report was approved as distributed.

C. Curricula and Courses Committee, Professor Peter Sederberg, Chair:

Before taking action on the committee's report, PROFESSOR SEDERBERG spoke to the Senate on a matter it had taken action on at its December meeting, namely, the new policy on independent study which in turn had raised questions about the issue of enforcement of the new policy. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG commented as follows:

Enforcement
of New
Policy on
Independent
Study

I have discussed the matter with Luke Gunter, the Registrar. He is revising the contractual form so that the new regulation will appear on the form and that the students' advisor and department chairman will have to testify that the course, if it is going to receive grade point credit, will be either the student's major, minor or cognate. He also points out that, obviously, the responsibility for enforcement is at the hands of the department head and advisor and I think this is where it appropriately belongs. He also indicated that if a student changed a major, minor or cognate, it would pose no problem to revise that student's academic record as long as the matter was brought to the attention of the Registrar.

Secondly, before we enter into this report I want to take this opportunity to thank the Graduate Council, particularly the committee on 500 and 600 level courses that did yeoman service in January considering 500 and 600 level courses that have to be jointly submitted to both our committee and theirs, so that we could bring this report to you in time to get these changes, if they are approved, into the fall semester curriculum.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG also informed the Senate of a number of editorial changes in the report, as follows:

1. Page A-5, under present wording, semester 2, Mathematics 12 should read Mathematics 122;
2. Page A-5, under proposed wording, semester 3, delete the line reading "Behavioral Science . . .3".
3. On pages A-6,A-7, under proposed wording for semesters 5, 6, 7, 8, delete references to "Professional Accounting Unit" 1, 2, 3, 4, respectively.

PROFESSOR PATRICK SCOTT, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, explained that his department's undergraduate director could not be present but had asked him to make an inquiry about the change in general education requirements page A-4, the proposed change in curriculum in the professional accounting program in the College of Business Administration. PROFESSOR SCOTT inquired as to whether or not the English Department had been asked for its comments on this proposal. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG answered "it is consistent with what is already being done". PROFESSOR SCOTT explained the description was causing a "sizeable scheduling problem". He added that the old requirement was less descriptive, i.e. "any courses numbered 282 or above". PROFESSOR HOWARD SANDERS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, explained that "our objective was to be consistent with the whole College of Business in the first two years of the program and therefore we will certainly change any time BA does". PROFESSOR CAROLINE STROBEL, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, explained there could be a problem "if we went ahead with something inconsistent with Business since many times students coming in particularly at this level would not know whether they are going to major in the College of Business". PROFESSOR SEDERBERG concluded that it seemed to him that "the most appropriate course of action would be for this issue to be discussed and a consistent proposal presented from the College of Business Administration . . .". PROFESSOR SCOTT also commented that on page A-4, under proposed wording, English 281 should read English 282 and that was accepted by the committee chair. CHAIRMAN PATTERSON called for the question and the proposal was approved.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG added an additional course under the deletions on page A-9, BADM 348, Commercial Law II. The Senate approved these deletions and then took action to approve the remainder of the proposal of the College of Business Administration, page A-9 - A-10. Approval was then granted for II, College of Engineering, page A-10 and then for III, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, page A-11 - A-12.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG informed the Senate of a number of editorial proposed changes in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, page A-13 - A-20:

1. Page A-15, under present wording, Intensive Major, MATH 500 should read MATH 550.
2. Page A-15, under proposed wording, 2. Major Requirements, insert the article "a" between the words "if" and "grade" and so that phrase should now read "if a grade of . . .".
3. Page A-18, under proposed wording, Bachelor of Science in Statistics, 2, should read "Major Requirements"- delete the word "of".
4. Page A-18, under proposed wording, Bachelor of Science and Statistics, Intensive Major, STAT 619 should read 519.
5. Page A-20, new courses, MATH 570, word "transporation" should read "transportation".

PROFESSOR ED MERCER, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, inquired as to whether or not the intent in number 2, page A-15 was "to allow a total of three opportunities" to take these courses. PROFESSOR SEDERBERG responded in the affirmative. The CHAIR called for the question and the Senate approved this proposal.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG moved for consideration on page A-20 the remaining proposals and corrected "topices" in the MATH 570 proposal to read "topics". The Senate approved the balance of the proposal on page A-20 and the change in prerequisites on page A-21.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG informed the Senate of the following editorial corrections:

1. Page A-21, in the former description of MATH 555, the word "measurabel" should read "measurable" and in the new description of MATH 555 word "Reimann" should read "Riemann".
2. Page A-21, the former description of MATH 122 (Prereq: MATH 12 should read MATH 121.
3. Page A-22, the former description of MATH 520 the word "linera" should read "linear".
4. Page A-22, the proposed description for MATH 540, the word "structues" should read "structures".
5. Substitute the following description for the newly proposed course MATH 561 Introduction to Mathematical Logic. (3) (Prereq: MATH 241) Syntax and semantics of formal languages; sentential logic, proofs in first order logic; Godel's completeness theorems; compactness theorem and applications; cardinals and ordinals; the Lowenheim Skolem-Tarski theorem; Beth's definability theorem, effectively computable functions; Godel's incompleteness theorem; undecidable theories.

The Senate then approved the material on pages A-21 and A-22.

PROFESSOR SEDERBERG informed the Senate of the following change, page A-23, the former description of MATH 524, insert the phrase "linear equality constraints and" between "constraints" and "linear". PROFESSOR COLIN BENNETT, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, also corrected the spelling of the word "algebra" on page A-22, in the proposed description for MATH 546. The Senate approved the proposed changes for the balance of pages A-22 and A-23. Finally, the Senate approved the proposals for VI, College of Health.

There were no reports from any other committees.

IV. Report of Secretary.

No report.

V. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.

VI. New Business.

The CHAIR called the Senate's attention to a resolution adopted by the Faculty of the College of Education in a motion, the text of which had been delivered to the Faculty Senate Office, and requested that any New Business be reserved until after this particular body of material had been dealt with. The CHAIR ruled that motions take precedence over announcements. He therefore recognized Professor Charles McNeill of the College of Education on behalf of the College of Education. PROFESSOR McNEILL requested that Professor Josephine Martin be allowed to read the resolution. PROFESSOR PATTERSON responded that "the Chair obviously was involved with the resolution and therefore I will stand aside on this decision and I will temporarily appoint for this particular decision the Chairman-elect, Professor Charles Weasmer". PROFESSOR WEASMER ruled that it was in order for PROFESSOR MARTIN to present the resolution of the College of Education.

Chair
Steps
Aside

PROFESSOR MARTIN explained that the following statement was unanimously adopted by the College of Education faculty at its regular general meeting of the Undergraduate Faculty on January 29, 1983:

College
of
Education
Resolution

On December 10, 1982 a decision was made by the Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina to eliminate all undergraduate degree programs in the College of Education. In a presentation to the Board prior to the decision of the Board, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate, Professor Robert Patterson, endorsed the process followed by the University Administration, implying that neither the faculty of the College of Education nor the Faculty Senate were deprived of their right to participate in the process which led to the decision. In light of Chairman Patterson's formal statement as Chairman of the Faculty Senate at an official meeting of the Board of Trustees the faculty of the College of Education moved the adoption of the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that Chairman Robert Patterson's statement to the Board of Trustees on December 10, 1982 which implied that neither the faculty of the College of Education nor Faculty Senators had any right to participate in the process leading to the elimination of any or of all undergraduate degree programs in the College of Education, is not consistent with the established rights and responsibilities of the faculty of the University of South Carolina.

PROFESSOR WEASMER stated that "since this is presented as a statement concerning the action of the Chairman of the Faculty Senate it then is appropriate for the Chairman to respond to this statement". PROFESSOR PATTERSON then read into the record a verbatim transcript of his remarks, said transcript made from the Board of Trustees official tape of its December 10, 1982 meeting. PROFESSOR PATTERSON also distributed copies of this transcript for the information of the Senate and he informed the Senate that he was prepared to play the tape of this meeting should there develop any question about the accuracy of this transcript:

Complete
Transcript of
Extemporaneous
Remarks by
Senate Chair
to Trustees
Dec. 10, 1983

I think it would be inappropriate for me as presiding officer of the Faculty Senate to comment personally on the merits of the various administrative proposals. However, I don't consider it inappropriate to comment on the procedures which have been followed. As general background information, or a reflection upon our predicament, I would offer you the simple remark that under these circumstances that we find ourselves in today, it is very easy to look for culprits, but very hard to find them. You are all familiar with the fact that a few years ago, that formula funding was instituted by the Legislature to prevent divisive and destructive competition among various institutions of higher learning in the State for legislative funding. And yet those of us who have been here for awhile know the answer to the question, how many times has the University of South Carolina been fully funded according to its formula? We know too that the Commission on Higher Education was instituted, at least in part, to avoid duplication of programs, and yet we all know that the Commission has expanded its mission to include academic planning that reaches into the institutions it was supposed to supervise. We also should be aware of the constraints placed upon this University, this Administration, and this Faculty, by the mandated and almost sudden requirement to produce a response for fiscal cutting by January 15, 1983. We are in a serious predicament, not of our own making. It's a very complex problem. In so far as faculty governance on this campus has been concerned, I would like to observe that this Administration, perhaps more than any preceding one, has involved faculty governance and specifically the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, in its mandated role given to it by the Board as the ultimate responsible authority for fiscal planning, to give advice on fiscal matters to the Administration and, in connection with this administrative policy, to accommodate the Faculty where no legal requirement was there. The Administration

over the last few years has sought the counsel of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and as this fiscal crisis emerged in late Summer and early Fall, the Administration once again came to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. And between late September and the early part of November, I think it is true to say that we considered at least thirty specific proposals and position papers and digests of fiscal information which had been provided to us by the Administration. We received the testimony of a number of administrative officers and specifically those--some of those who were speaking for the financial office of the University. And on the Fourth of November, we presented our recommendations to the Administration with the understanding that these recommendations were recommendations only--that the ultimate responsibility for making proposals to the Board of Trustees was with the Administration. At the same time, in making our recommendations to the Administration, we made it clear that our recommendations were fiscal in nature only, and were not to be taken as substitutes for academic planning. In summary, faculty governance has been consulted on fiscal matters. The recommendations are the responsibility of the Administration. What I have said to you this morning is a testimonial not to the nature of these recommendations, but a testimonial to the process. Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR PATTERSON followed the reading of the transcript by making the following comments:

Additional
Comments
by the
Chair

I am at a loss to understand why the College of Education should consider that my remarks implied neither the Education faculty nor the Faculty Senate had or has the right to participate in the decision making process. My remarks are consistent with the established rights and responsibilities of the USC faculty as defined by the Faculty Manual. Nowhere in my remarks to the Board do I mention the faculty of the College of Education nor do I describe any limitation on the right of the University faculty or that of the Education faculty to participate in the decision making process. On the contrary, after referring to some of the factors that contributed to the need for making recommendations to the Board of Trustees before the Budget and Control Board's deadline of January 15, 1983 I described the particular level of faculty consultation which I endorsed, namely, the role of the expanded Steering Committee in making fiscal recommendations to the Administration. Furthermore, I specifically stated that although the Faculty Senate Steering Committee had only advisory powers in fiscal recommendations to the Administration that "we made it clear that our recommendations were fiscal only and were not to be taken as substitutes for academic planning". My statement closed with a reiteration of the area of faculty governance about which I was referring and with a repetition of the understanding between the Senate Steering Committee and the Administration about the Administration's fiscal prerogatives. My remarks to the Board carefully refrained from endorsing the nature or the contents of the Administration's recommendations to the Board, a point I also made at the outset.

To further clarify the process of faculty involvement let me cite some events from my calendar. On or about September 24, 1982 Provost Borkowski alerted the Steering Committee to the University's fiscal crisis and for the need for formulating proposals to the Board of Trustees by December 1982. My calendar shows some seven meetings devoted to questions, to presentations of fiscal data and to oral testimony. The Steering Committee made its recommendations to the Provost about November 5th and on November 11th the Provost advised the Senate Steering Committee of the Administration's intended fiscal strategies. Concurrently with the end of this advisory process the Chair was then alerted by the Provost to the need for the special nine person committee to be formed for the purpose of gaining authority for possible reductions in tenured faculty and programs. As the Faculty Senate's

legislation relating to the function of the nine person committee says in part "the decision to discontinue or reduce a program or instructional unit must be arrived at jointly by the President and the Faculty Committee", referring of course to the nine person committee. Has the Faculty Senate been informed about the process? Consultation by Senators of the Faculty Senate Minutes from October through December will establish that the Faculty Senate has been informed about the University reactions to the fiscal crisis, by the President of the University, by the Provost and by the Chair. In October, the President advised the Senate of the fact that the Senate Steering Committee was involved with advising the Administration about the budget. In November, the President alerted the Senate to the mandated deadline and to the issue of phase out. In December he stated that no tenured faculty would be involved and that affected faculty would have the right to address the Board of Trustees.

You will recall too that one of the measures that the Senate passed in the fall was the expanded membership of the Steering Committee for the purpose of advising the Administration about fiscal matters. The College of Education has representation in the Faculty Senate and one of its members served on the nine person committee. My remarks to the Board of Trustees do not imply, as the College of Education's resolution states, "That neither the Education faculty nor the Faculty Senate had a right to participate in the decision making process". The procedures followed were those established by the Faculty Senate and it is that procedure which I endorsed in a limited way. I don't want to engage in polemics. I hope that these remarks will put the issue to rest. I do not consider a polemical debate to be in the best interest of faculty governance and so I call for no response from the Senate to this statement. Thank you very much.

PROFESSOR WEASMER continuing to serve as the Chair, pointed out to the Senate that because there was no motion before the house and no request for action there was really no business to be debated. PROFESSOR WEASMER then recognized Professor Judith Joyner, College of Education, who informed the Senate that she had been elected by the College of Education faculty to make a statement before the Board of Trustees "after that statement or resolution was made then a number of people representing the administration made statements which we were not able to rebut". In reaction to Professor Patterson's statement, PROFESSOR JOYNER concluded that "he has reread what he stated before the Board of Trustees and defended his position". PROFESSOR JOYNER added that she believed that "it is not in the best interest of the faculty of this University to prohibit a response to Chairman Patterson". PROFESSOR WEASMER, continuing to serve as the Chair, interpreted that Professor Patterson's statement had been presented as a matter of information and he reiterated that was not a motion before the house to be debated. PROFESSOR WEASMER added that if Professor Joyner wished to present information and/or counter statements, that such could be handled as items of information under Good of the Order. PROFESSOR WEASMER also stated that it was his understanding that the motion initially introduced by Professor McNeill "does not touch upon the conduct of the remarks of the Chairman of the Faculty Senate" and the correctness of his understanding as such was confirmed. Therefore, PROFESSOR WEASMER relinquished the Chair to Professor Patterson who in turn recognized Professor Charles McNeill of the College of Education. PROFESSOR MCNEILL introduced the following motion (copy entered into the Minutes as distributed to the Senate):

On January 28, 1983, the faculty of the College of Education unanimously approved the following motion:

College of
Education
Motion

That our senators move at the next Faculty Senate meeting that a committee be elected by the Faculty Senate to evaluate the process used in eliminating the undergraduate program in the College of Education and that the committee have a date to report back to the Faculty Senate.

As a senator from the College of Education, I therefore move

That a committee be elected by the Faculty Senate to evaluate the process used in eliminating the undergraduate program in the College of Education and that this committee report back to the Faculty Senate on April 6, 1983.

Amendment
to
Refer
Investigation
to
Faculty
Advisory
Committee

Before the Chair recognized the motion, he requested that the size of the requested committee be specified. The Acting Secretary inquired as to whether or not there was a second for the motion. PROFESSOR McNEILL specified that a five member committee was called for. The motion was seconded by Professor Josephine Martin, College of Education. The CHAIR ruled that this was a properly introduced motion, properly seconded, and that according to the Faculty Manual, the normal standing committee for dealing with matters of this nature appears to the Chair to be the Faculty Advisory Committee. The CHAIR then called for discussion on the motion. PROFESSOR RAY MOORE, GOVERNMENT AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, responded that "it seems to me that the resolution itself entered into the motion is probably a good idea" and added that he concurred with the Chair there already exists an appropriate elected committee of the Senate to deal with this business. PROFESSOR MOORE added that the jurisdiction of the Faculty Advisory Committee is defined in the Faculty Manual which would encompass this kind of resolution. Therefore, PROFESSOR MOORE moved to amend the motion "to suggest that the business of the motion be addressed to the Faculty Advisory Committee for investigation, reporting back rather than electing a brand new committee from the beginning". The CHAIR ruled that the amended motion was to the effect that "the Faculty Advisory Committee be given the function of evaluating the process used in eliminating the undergraduate program in the College of Education and that this committee report back to the Faculty Senate on April 6, 1983". PROFESSOR MOORE accepted that statement as his amendment. The amendment was seconded by PROFESSOR DAVID HUSBAND, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY. The CHAIR inquired of Professor Husband as to whether or not he was a Senator. PROFESSOR HUSBAND answered in the affirmative. There was no further discussion and the amendment was approved. The CHAIR returned the Senate's consideration to the main motion which was approved by the Senate.

There were no additional matters of New Business.

VI. Good of the Order.

PROFESSOR JUDITH JOYNER, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, presented the following statement:

Statement by
Professor
Joyner

For those of you who do not know me, I was appointed a member of the Faculty in September of 1960 and have been a member of this body. I have served as Secretary of this body. I have chaired the Curricula and Courses Committee. I have dealt with deans who have been very angry with me because of the process through which they had to go in order to change the title of a course and you have just seen the process that has to be gone through in order to change the title of a course. The concern of the College of Education about the process is that approximately 200 courses, in effect, are to be deleted, probably 25 degree programs. In fact, the entire undergraduate College of Education is to be eliminated and that was kept a matter of secrecy, my friend, until after it had gone forward to the Board of Trustees. For this reason we think that process is not consistent with what I have always understood to be the rights and responsibilities of the faculty of this University with respect to curriculum and program changes. I want to remind you please that in December before this Faculty Senate the President said with respect to prospective changes "I cannot be terribly explicit today because some of the units (that is the College of Education, for one) haven't been fully contacted and would prefer not to surprise anybody by a public announcement here." That was December the 1st. These minutes came out to the Faculty dated December the 16th - 6 days after the Board of Trustees acted and my copy I got when I got back from the Christmas holidays. Now I know that the Administration has a rationale for keeping this matter secret from the faculty - I'm sure there must be a rationale. I just don't understand it and I think I am speaking for the faculty when I say I have not yet heard one faculty member that understands how it is that the Administration can by whatever means eliminate or at least propose to the Board of Trustees to eliminate that entire undergraduate college

without any input by the faculty in the usual process. I just cannot imagine what the faculty of Business Administration would say if they were told after the matter had gone to the Board of Trustees that the undergraduate College of Business Administration had been eliminated. I've been proud of this faculty. I have seen men here who have stood up. I'll tell you they have stood up in the face of the Administration. Thomas F. Jones was given a fit by some of you men. And I enjoyed it - I have to say I did. I know many of you in this building have fought for the rights and responsibilities of the faculty and so when I have heard this great silence on the part of the leadership of the Faculty Senate after the Board of Trustees' meeting I have to say to you, as much concerned as I was about the Education program in South Carolina, as much as I am concerned about other things, nothing has more of concern to me than the fact that after, and I am not going to read my statement before the Board of Trustees which was the statement of the faculty but state in effect that the faculty were not included at all in the process. I don't know about Dr. Mandeville - I never heard from Dr. Mandeville. No one heard from Dr. Mandeville about what he did on any committee at this point not to this day.

I am talking about colleagues who are brilliant men and women and you know very well that you cannot present a fiscal matter without presenting those matters to which those fiscal things pertain. The undergraduate College of Education has a student body larger than the entire student body of 10 private institutions in this state. I cannot believe that there is not one voice in this Faculty Senate that will not say "if my undergraduate college is going to be eliminated I have the right to know that that is being discussed and I have a right to have an input before at least it goes to the Board of Trustees". So we were told on December the 3rd, my friends, that's Friday, that the undergraduate college is going to be eliminated and we could speak to the Board of Trustees - we had four working days and without even a plan or without even any proposal in writing which we could respond so that the only thing that we were able to say is we feel that we should have been allowed to have been involved in the process. We feel that we should have known something about the plan before the action was taken by the Board of Trustees. If you could eliminate the undergraduate College of Education and Business Administration or any other undergraduate college on this campus in this way then why do I care about the right to vote on your right to change your grade? My friend, I wanted to change a title of a course from Philosophy of Education to Philosophy and Education and do you know how long it took me - through 3 committees in the College of Education and the Faculty Senate or the Curricula and Courses Committee - almost 6 months. But do I forfeit 25 degree programs in the undergraduate college affecting thousands of people all over the state without violating my rights or my responsibilities as a faculty member? I am sorry. I have tried to understand but I cannot.

PROFESSOR RAY MOORE responded that "those of us that have known Professor Joyner over a long period of years know that she has the heart of a lion and she has been a long battler for faculty rights". PROFESSOR MOORE then asked the Senate and President Holderman for any comments on the general thrust of her remarks. PROFESSOR JERRY CURRY, DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC, stated that it was apparent to him that the resolution presented by the College of Education "doesn't really respond to what Professor Joyner was talking about . . . it simply attacked the Chairman of the Faculty Senate rather than concerning itself with serious matters that he is talking about . . ." He concluded that "we didn't solve anything by listening to this . . ." PRESIDENT HOLDERMAN responded as follows:

President
Responds

Let me without dwelling on the subject that has already been addressed and certainly indicate that the Administration, the Provost, all of us would be happy to meet with the Faculty Advisory Committee at its pleasure to discuss the processes that were followed. I don't pretend today with interest to pursue it

in this format but would be glad, as I have been since I've been President, to meet with the Senate as regularly as possible to address issues that confront it. There are always multiple sides of every issue and I am sure that the Faculty Advisory Committee, Mr. Chairman, will determine that there is a position and perhaps more than one on this particular matter. And we will be glad to meet with it and provide it all the information that it needs in its evaluation.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FELIX responded as Chairman of the Faculty Advisory Committee and stated "this body can be assured that the Faculty Advisory Committee will take full and comprehensive attention to the matter".

There were no further comments under the Good of the Order or Announcements.

The Senate was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.